

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

Applicant is amending Figures 1 and 2 herein to include the label "Prior Art." In addition, Figure 1 is amended to change the reference label "ROM 125" to --RAM 125--. An amended copy of Figures 1 and 2, marked with the identifier "Replacement Sheet," are attached hereto. The Examiner's approval of these drawing changes is respectfully requested.

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully asks for reconsideration of both this application and the Office Action dated November 5, 2004.

In the Office Action, the Examiner maintained the telephonic restriction requirement made on October 20, 2004. Applicants respectfully submit that this restriction requirement is now moot. In an effort to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicants have canceled non-elected claims 16-24 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants therefore ask that the restriction requirement be withdrawn.

Next, the Examiner objected to the drawings for various informalities. Applicants have amended Figures 1 and 2 herein to include the label "Prior Art." In addition, Figure 1 is amended to change the reference label "ROM 125" to --RAM 125--. An amended copy of Figures 1 and 2, marked with the identifier "Replacement Sheet," are attached hereto. With regard to the objections under 37 C.F.R. §1.84(p)(5), Applicants have amended the specification to include the reference characters noted by the Examiner. Applicants therefore ask that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

The specification also was objected to for a minor typographical error in paragraph 54. Applicants have amended this paragraph to remove the noted informality. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

The Examiner additionally objected to the current title of the application, on the grounds that it is not descriptive, and does not clearly indicate the invention to which the claims are directed. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection, and ask for its reconsideration. The

Examiner has not identified what relevant information is lacking from the current title. In fact, claims 1-4 recite “an application...comprising: a client portal...” while claims 6-15 specifically recite a “client portal.” Applicants therefore submit that the current title of the application does clearly indicate the invention to which the claims are directed. Applicants therefore request that the objection to the title of the application be withdrawn.

Next, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over the RealPlayer 5.0 Manual from RealNetworks, Inc. (hereafter referred to as the “RealPlayer manual”). The Examiner also rejected claims 1, 2, and 5-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,029,141 to Bezos et al. Applicants respectfully traverse both of these rejections, and courteously ask for their reconsideration.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the subject matter originally recited in claim 5, and claim 5 has been canceled. Claims 1-4 therefore now recite that the client portal is capable of retrieving content from only preselected sites in the network. Claims 6-15 similarly recite a client portal comprising a browser capable of retrieving content from only preselected sites that are related to providing a particular product. Thus, the client portal according to the claimed invention is limited to accessing only specific sites. As described in detail in the specification, this functionality permits a party to ensure that the content obtained through the invention complies with desired requirements, such as relevance to a particular product or service or a particular format.

These features of the invention are not taught or suggested by either the RealPlayer manual or the Bezos et al. patent. For example, Applicants invite the Examiner’s attention to

page 13 of the Realplayer manual.<sup>1</sup> This portion of the manual explains describes a “Scan” button provided by the Realplayer Plus 5.0 application, which “allows [a user] to scan available content.” This portion of the manual also states that the “Destination Buttons” relied upon by the Examiner are programmed to content selected by a user. The Examiner also is invited to review, for example, page 34 of the RealPlayer manual, which explains how the “Preset Buttons” can be set to retrieve content from any URL specified by the user. Accordingly, the RealPlayer manual does not teach or suggest a client portal capable of retrieving content from only preselected sites in a network, or a browser capable of retrieving content from only preselected sites that are related to providing a particular product, as recited in claims 1-4 and 6-15.

The Bezos et al. patent is even less relevant to the claimed invention than the RealPlayer manual. The Bezos et al. patent is directed to a relationship between Web sites rather than to a client portal or browser, as recited in claims 1-4 and 6-15. More particularly, it is directed to an “associate” Web site that provides “referral links” to other “merchant” Web sites. The Bezos et al. patent specifically teaches that the merchant Web site may be accessed through a conventional browser, such as Microsoft’s Internet Explorer or Netscape’s Navigator. (See, e.g., column 6, lines 59-63, specifically relied upon by the Examiner). This patent does not teach or suggest a browser capable of retrieving content from only preselected sites that are related to providing a particular product, as recited in claims 6-15. Likewise, the Bezos et al. patent does not teach or suggest a client portal capable of retrieving content from only preselected sites, as recited in

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action included only page 11 of the RealPlayer manual. Applicants have obtained a *complete* copy of the RealPlayer manual from the Web site <http://docs.real.com/docs/plyrplus50.pdf>, however, which is attached

claims 1-4.

Applicants therefore submit that the RealPlayer 5.0 manual does not teach or suggest the features of the invention recited in any of claims 1-4 and 6-15. It is similarly urged that the Bezos et al. patent does not teach or suggest the features of the invention recited in any of claims 1-4 and 6-15. Accordingly, Applicants request that both the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4 over the RealPlayer manual and the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 6-15 over the Bezos et al. patent be withdrawn.

Claim 14 was then rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over the Bezos et al. patent in view of “Recommender Systems in E-Commerce” by Shafer et al. (hereafter referred to as the “Shafer et al. article”), while claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over the Bizrate.com Web page. Lastly, claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over the Bezos et al. patent in view of allegedly admitted prior art disclosed in Applicants’ specification. Applicants respectfully traverse each of these rejections, and ask for their reconsideration.

As explained in detail above, the Bezos et al. patent does not teach or suggest a client portal capable of retrieving content from only preselected sites, as recited in claims 1-4. This patent likewise does not teach or suggest a browser capable of retrieving content from only preselected sites that are related to providing a particular product, as recited in claims 6-15. Applicants courteously submit that nothing in the Shafer et al. article, the Bizrate.com Web site, or Applicants’ own specification would remedy the omissions of the Bezos et al. patent. Accordingly, it is submitted that no combination of the Bezos et al. patent, the Shafer et al.

---

hereto.

article, the Bizrate.com Web site, or prior art allegedly disclosed in Applicants' own specification would teach or suggest the features of the invention recited in any of claims 3, 14, and 15. Applicants therefore ask that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

It is believed that no fees are due for the entry and consideration of this Amendment. If, however, the Commissioner believes that fees are required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees deemed necessary to maintain the pendency of this application, including any fees under 35 U.S.C. §1.16 and §1.17, to the deposit account of the undersigned, Deposit Account No. 19-0733.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are allowable, and that this application is therefore in condition for allowance. Applicants courteously ask for favorable action at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

By: By S. K. #51,255 FOR  
Thomas L. Evans, Reg. No. 35,805  
1001 G Street, N.W., 11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597  
Telephone: (202) 824-3000  
Facsimile: (202) 824-3001